



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

happy days each parish chose its own elders, and they, along with such of the landed proprietors as were members of the Church, chose the minister. And as they usually chose the best, Scotland "flourished by the preaching of the Word."

So eminently had Scotland become a Christian nation, that when a union with England began to be agitated, the main subject of solicitude was the national religion. The wisest men then perceived, what has since been amply verified, that the Union would be productive of many temporal benefits to the Scottish people. But all were apprehensive that the Church might eventually suffer. They knew that in the Parliament which would hereafter govern them, not one vote in ten would be a Presbyterian vote; and when any question arose affecting the Church of Scotland, it might be misunderstood and mis-settled. To relieve this nervousness of the nation, a clause was put into the Articles of Union providing that the Church of Scotland, as it then existed, should never be altered, and that the Sovereign should swear, on his accession, to maintain that Church in all its privileges.

This solemn stipulation quieted the apprehensions of the people; and after the pathos naturally felt at the "end of the auld sang"* had passed away, the country was settling down into complacency with the new state of things, when an incident occurred which verified the gloomiest forebodings of the old patriotic party, and fixed in the vitals of the Scottish Establishment an arrow which, after rankling for a century, threatens to be fatal now.

Towards the latter end of the reign of Queen Anne, it is well known that the Jacobite party were engaged in machinations to subvert the Protestant succession and

* "There's an end of an auld sang"—the observation of the Lord Chancellor Seafield, as he adjourned the Scottish Parliament for ever

restore the Pretender to the throne. Rightly judging that Presbyterianism, and the Presbyterian clergy, formed the main barrier to their purposes in the North, they resolved, if possible, to neutralize this element. It struck them that if they could get the appointment of the clergy into their own hands, they might gradually fill the Church with men after their own hearts. Accordingly, to the consternation of every leal-hearted Scotchman, word arrived in Edinburgh in the end of March, 1712, that a Bill had been introduced into Parliament for bestowing on certain patrons the power of presenting ministers to all the parishes in Scotland. Some of the ablest ministers were forthwith despatched to London with instructions to offer the most strenuous opposition to the measure. But it was the policy of its authors to precipitate it to the utmost, that it might be an Act of Parliament before Scotland could raise its remonstrance, and they succeeded. Though Principal Carstares and his colleagues posted to London as fast as their horses could carry them; they found the Bill in the House of Lords already; and though they succeeded in getting a hearing at the bar of the House, Lord Bolingbroke had made up his mind; and no sooner had the counsel for the Scotch Commissioners ended, than it was moved that the Bill be now read a second time, which being agreed to, it was committed, reported, and read a third time—the whole five stages being condensed with dramatic effect into *a single day*. By this Act, Presbyteries were “obliged to receive and admit such qualified persons as should be presented by the respective patrons.”

Heavy as was this blow, and discouraged as people were, there was still some hope concerning this thing. So deep-rooted was the popular aversion to patronage, that it was some time before patrons ventured to issue presentations, or presentees to accept them, and some even

hoped that the Act might tacitly subside into a dead letter. On the other hand, though the General Assembly * felt that they and their people had lost a *privilege*—and that they felt this is sufficiently proved by the fact, that down to 1784 they continued to protest against patronage as a “grievance”—they hoped that they had not lost their *freedom*—that even were patronage in active operation there might still be protection for the people in the courts of the Church. There existed on the Scottish statute-book an unrepealed law, declaring that “the Lord Jesus, as king and head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate;” and “that the civil magistrate may not assume to himself administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” They believed that the Act establishing the Church had made the spiritual courts the final judge in causes spiritual, even as it had made the civil courts the final judge in causes civil. They hoped that in virtue of this co-ordinate and independent jurisdiction, they might decide for themselves whether the patron’s nominee was or was not a *qualified* person, and admit or reject him accordingly. At all events, as a *presentation to a living* is a mere civil affair, and the *admission to the cure of souls* is a spiritual act, the Church courts imagined that if they should at any time be constrained, in compliance with the prayers of the people, to reject a patron’s presentee, it would be compensation enough if the patron got the fruits of the benefice (as the law provides), in which case the patron might give his protégé *the living*, and a more acceptable pastor might get *the cure of souls*. By considerations like these, the Church of Scotland flattered

* The Supreme Ecclesiastical Court of Scotland, consisting of ministers and ruling elders.

herself that her people would still enjoy protection, and her Church courts, spiritual freedom. This persuasion became positive assurance, when it was found how scrupulously the secular courts abstained from tampering with spiritual sentences. In those days the Supreme Civil Court of Scotland* refused to interfere when asked to discharge or overrule the deliverances of the ecclesiastical courts; and they did so on the simple ground that the Church courts knew best how to deal with spiritual questions; and even if they did not, the constitution of the country had made **THE CHURCH COURTS SUPREME IN THE SPIRITUAL PROVINCE.**

Whether Lord Kames and Monboddo and the other judges of last century were too fastidious in their non-interference—whether they were actuated by a spirit of chivalrous etiquette, or by their knowledge of constitutional law—certain it is, that they forbore from reviewing the sentences of spiritual courts, even as the spiritual courts forbore from reviewing theirs. The General Assembly did not decide on disputed march-dykes, or marriage settlements; nor did the Court of Session decide on the fitness of ministers for their parishes, or of candidates for admission to the communion-table. The General Assembly imposed no fines, and sent nobody to prison; and the Court of Session, with similar forbearance, neither ordained ministers, nor deposed them—neither admitted church members, nor excommunicated them. Somehow or other, they held on their several ways in wondrous harmony. There were no collisions, for each kept his own line.

Dear reader, if I thought you had patience for it, I would tell you how the collision arose, and I am sure, if you knew all the particulars and were on the jury, you would give a deodand on the Court of Session engine.

It was in the year 1834, on the 24th of May—I remem-

* The Court of Session.

ber it well, for I was there myself—and in the Tron Kirk of Edinburgh, where the General Assembly was sitting, that a ruling elder rose to bring forward a motion. His name was Sir James Moncrieff, a man long known at the bar of Scotland as the best lawyer there, and by that time one of the Lords of Session. He made a speech very learned and very long ;—of which speech the substance was, that ever since the Reformation, the Church of Scotland had paid respect to the wishes of the people in the settlement of ministers ; so much so, that according to its uniform interpretation, no minister was *qualified* for a parish, unless he were *acceptable* to its Christian people, the communicants of that parish. But though the doctrine of the Church had been uniform, its practice had varied, A *call* or invitation from the people had always been, in Presbyterian usage, a pre-requisite to the settlement of a minister. But sometimes this call had been so scanty that it could scarcely be deemed an invitation. And with a view to make the practice correspond with the theory, he would propose that, whenever a patron issued a presentation, the very first thing the Presbytery should do, would be to send the presentee to preach in that parish, and then to call together the male heads of families in communion with the Church, and ascertain their mind. If they consented to have this man for their minister, good and well. The Presbytery should proceed to examine him, and if they found his literature, theology, and character, sufficient to warrant them in ordaining him, they should admit him to that parish. But if a majority came forward, and solemnly declared that—apart from all factious motives—they were constrained, by regard for their own and their children's souls, to refuse this man for their minister, Lord Moncrieff proposed, that this *Veto* by a majority of the people should disqualify that presentee, and that the Presbytery should not *intrude* him into that parish against the expressed

mind of its Christian householders;* but should send word to the patron that he might present another. The majority of the Assembly thought this an excellent proposal; all the rather that the Crown lawyers, the Lord Advocate and Solicitor-General, declared that it was perfectly competent for the Assembly, in virtue of its inherent powers, to pass such a law, and as it was a judge of the Supreme Civil Court, and one so noted for his legal skill, who introduced the measure. And so, to the great joy of thousands, the Veto Law was passed.†

For some time it wrought delightfully, and almost every one was saying, How much the patrons are improved! for, in point of fact, the patrons presented such acceptable ministers, that out of 200 only ten were vetoed. But at last, the new law fell heavy on one individual. A licentiate, ‡—was presented to a large parish, with 3,000 inhabitants. Two of the people

* The Veto Law restricted the privilege of objecting, in the settlement of ministers, to those parishioners who were both heads of houses and members of the Church. In Scotland, none are communicants, or members of the Church, except those with whose religious knowledge and good character the ministers and elders are satisfied. In Church-of-Scotland language, *the people* are the communicants, the members of the Church, the professing Christian people.

† It is important to remark, that in this Assembly were no chapel ministers, or ministers of *quoad sacra* parishes. Besides the Crown lawyers in Scotland, the Lord High Chancellor, and the Attorney-General of England, both extolled the Veto Law, as a great public improvement.

‡ In the Church of Scotland there is a staff of probationers or licentiates who are allowed to preach, but who exercise no other function of the ministry. These probationers are eligible for the ministry, but they are not ministers. They have received no ordination, and are permitted to preach merely to make trial of their gifts. If a probationer who is presented to a parish be not unacceptable to the people, he is ordained, and becomes a minister. Allowing that patronage is a trust reposed in patrons by the State, it becomes an interesting question, whether this trust is designed for the benefit of probationers or the good of the people? It has usually been exercised for behoof of the former.

thought that he might do well enough for a minister; but all the rest thought that he was not fit to be *their* minister. Consequently, the Presbytery refused to admit him. Hereupon this man and his patron raised an action against the Presbytery, and petitioned the Court of Session to find that the Presbytery was *bound* to take him on trial, with a view to admission. So far as any spiritual consequences (such as ordination) were implied in the decision, the Presbytery declined the competency of the Court of Session to judge the case; but as they were anxious to ascertain whether their rejection of a vetoed presentee implied that he should also lose the living, they allowed the case to be argued in their name so far as any *civil* effect was concerned. Five of the judges held that this was not a case for the Court of Session at all; but that if they were to give an opinion, they must say that the General Assembly had done quite right in passing the Veto Law, and the Presbytery had done no wrong in obeying it.* But the other eight judges were of a contrary opinion, and the House of Lords affirmed their judgment.

Since this decision, it has become the fashion in the North to carry every case out of the Church courts into the Court of Session. Presbyteries are prohibited from deposing ministers convicted of drunkenness and theft. Ministers are prohibited, under pain of imprisonment, from preaching in certain districts of country. Kirk sessions are forbidden to debar from the Lord's table parties whose presence they consider a desecration. And the General Assembly itself is not at liberty to admit any member, whom the Court of Session may disapprove. And so uniformly do a majority of their

* Besides Lord Moncrieff, the original author of the Veto Law, these five included Lords Jeffrey (more familiarly known in the worlds of philosophy and criticism as Francis Jeffrey), Cockburn, Glenlee, and Fullerton. The names of the other eight, however respectable in their station, would not be interesting to English readers.

Lordships decide against the ecclesiastical parties, even when their decisions contradict one another, that it has become the more prudent, because more economical course, to allow judgment to go forth in absence. As it is, the law expenses have become such a grievous fine, that the stipend of some parishes is arrested for payment of costs, and pious and accomplished ministers, with their families, are, in the absence of their wonted income, reduced to painful straits. Though this be matter of exultation with their oppressors, and not complained of by the sufferers themselves, the English nation is not what it was, if such severities when known arouse no indignation.

But to resume and end this narrative. The Presbytery of Auchterarder did not obey the sentence of the civil courts, ordering them to admit to the ministry the vetoed presentee. They refused, because they believed that the court had, in this cause, no right to command. They refused, because they thought it would be a solemn mockery and a sin to ordain a man to a cure of souls, where every one deprecated and dreaded his admission. They thought, that the only inducement to ordain him would be to give him a right to the stipend; and as the patron was now in the possession of the stipend, he might, if he pleased, hand it over to his protégé. But the presentee prosecuted the Presbytery for 16,000*l.* of damages, because of the wrong which they had done him in refusing to admit him; and both the Court of Session and the House of Lords having found in his favour, it is now finally declared by the civil courts, that *they will enforce their sentences against the spiritual courts by civil pains and penalties*, the ordinary compulsitors of the law.

When this decision was given last autumn, it put an end to all expectation from the civil courts. Till then, the most desponding could scarce believe their own forebodings, or persuade themselves that their Church was so

changed from what their ancestors had left it, and they themselves once imagined it to be. But the decision of last August ended every dream, and bade the Church make ready for the worst.

It was in this emergency that the Meeting or Convocation mentioned in the outset was convened. It originated with a select body of the oldest and most experienced ministers. They invited all of their brethren who had manifested concern for the ancient constitution of the Church, to assemble in Edinburgh, on the 17th of November last. Nearly 500 came together; and it was very plain that no ordinary call could have brought from the remotest headlands of a rugged land, such a company in the dead season of the year.

After a prayer-meeting in St. George's Church, and a sermon by Dr. Chalmers,—“Unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness,”—the ministers adjourned to Roxburgh Church. Dr. Chalmers took the chair. It was agreed, that during each sederunt three of the brethren should engage in prayer; and in this way confession and supplication assumed a prominent place in the business of each Meeting. None but ministers were present. In order to encourage each member freely to speak his mind this privacy was requisite, and it tended greatly to impart a confiding and conversational tone to their proceedings. For our own part, it made us feel, that the innermost side of good men is the best side; and whilst listening to the brotherly tone of their communings, so unlike the defiance and disdain of high debate, and to the noble sentiments of Christian heroism and self-renunciation which were ever and anon expressed, we wished that the world were present. And, during the devotional exercises and at intervals throughout the deliberations, when sudden light or consolation broke in, in a way which brought tears to many eyes, we would have liked that all the Christians in the kingdom could

be present, for we felt assured that the Lord himself was there. And then, when we looked at the materials of the Meeting and saw before us, with few exceptions, all the talent, and, with still fewer exceptions, all the piety of the Church of Scotland, we wished that those were present in whose power it lies to preserve to the Scottish Establishment all this learning and this worth. There was the chairman, who might so easily have been the Adam Smith, the Leibnitz, or the Bossuet of the day; but who, having obtained a better part, has laid economics, and philosophy, and eloquence on the altar which sanctified himself. There was Dr. Gordon, lofty in simplicity, whose vast conceptions and majestic emotions plough deeper the old channels of customary words, and make common phrases appear solemn and sublime after *he* has used them. There were Dr. Keith, whose labours in the prophecies have sent his fame through Europe, and are yearly bringing converts into the Church of Christ; and Mr. James Buchanan, whose deep-drawn sympathy, and rich Bible-lore, and Christian refinement, have made him a son of consolation to so many of the sons of sorrow. There were Dr. Welsh, the biographer and bosom friend of Thomas Brown; Dr. Forbes, among the most inventive of modern mathematicians; and Dr. Paterson, whose "Manse Garden" is read for the sake of its poetry and wisdom and Christian kindness, where there are no gardens, and will be read for the sake of other days when there are no manses. And there was Dr. Patrick McFarlan, whose calm judgment is a sanction to any measure; and who, holding the richest benefice in Scotland, most appropriately moved the resolution, that rather than sacrifice their principles, they should surrender their possessions. And not to mention "names the poet must not speak," there were in that assembly the men who are dearest of all to the godly throughout the land—the men whom the

Lord hath delighted to honour—all the ministers in whose parishes have been great revivals, from the Apostle of the North, good old Mr. Macdonald, whose happy countenance is a signal for expectation and gladness in every congregation he visits; and Mr. Burns, of Kilsyth, whose affectionate counsels and prayers made the Convocation feel towards him as a father; down to those younger ministers of whom, but for our mutual friendship, I could speak more freely. When we looked at the whole, knowing something of all, we felt, first, such an assembly never met in Scotland before; secondly, it will depend on them, under God, whether Scotland can ever furnish such an assembly again; and, thirdly, what a blot on any reign, and what a guilt on any Government, which casts forth such a company! And then, after some sadder musings, came in this thought, Yet, what a blessing to the world if they were scattered abroad, everywhere preaching the word!

Six days were spent in deliberation. Nearly all agreed that the Church of Scotland was ruined by the late decision; and that she could not submit to these encroachments of the civil courts without losing her character as a true Church of Christ. The next question was, What should be done? It was agreed to make a final application to the Legislature for relief—for protection to the Church courts in the exercise of their spiritual jurisdiction—and if this application were refused, it was the almost universal conviction that it would be the duty of ministers and people, rather than protract the struggle and embroil the country, to leave the Establishment.

Accordingly, that final application is now made; and it depends very much on the people of England what answer shall be returned. No measure will meet the case which does not give the Church courts of Scotland freedom from secular molestation in the discharge of their spiritual

functions: in other words, no measure which does not give the ministers and Christian people of Scotland the same immunities which they believed till now to be their birthright, and which they unquestionably enjoyed in the reign of William III. The following considerations in behalf of such a measure, are respectfully submitted to whatever of justice, generosity, and Christian principle, may exist in England :—

1. The Treaty of Union has been violated. By that treaty it was solemnly stipulated that the Presbyterian Church government, *as then existing*, should be the only Church government within the kingdom of Scotland; and, that each successive sovereign, “at his or her accession to the crown, should swear and subscribe, that they shall inviolably maintain and preserve the foresaid settlement of the true Protestant religion, with the *government*, worship, discipline, *rights and privileges* of this Church, as above established by the laws of this kingdom” (of Scotland). Adherence to this stipulation is farther “declared to be a fundamental and essential condition of the said treaty or union in all time coming.” And on the strength of this stipulation the Union was completed. Now, among “the rights and privileges” which the Church of Scotland enjoyed before the Union, *spiritual freedom* was unquestionably one. Her people were not liable to the intrusion of unacceptable ministers; nor were her Church courts, when deliberating on the most sacred interests of Christ’s kingdom, liable to the intrusion, the intimidation, and coercion, of secular tribunals. If the Church has lost her freedom, *when did she lose it?* To this there is only one answer: In the year 1712, five years after the Union was effected: A law was then enacted, which, if the interpretation put on it by the civil courts be sound, has robbed the Church of Scotland of the dearest “right,” the most precious “privilege,” which, at the time of the Union, she enjoyed: her accountability, in sacred

things, to God alone. If this interpretation be incorrect, if the civil courts misunderstand the law, then the Legislature should say so, and rescue the Church from the groundless molestations of the secular power. If the interpretation be correct, if the civil courts rightly interpret the statute, then the Treaty of Union is broken, and Scotland must look to the good faith of England for redress.

2. The case of the Church of Scotland is one of peculiar hardship. And when I say the Church of Scotland, I mean those in the Scottish Establishment who adhere, as almost all her pious ministers and people do adhere, to the original constitution of the Church of Scotland.

If they do not get redress, they must leave the Establishment; and even though it be for Christ's sake and the Gospel's, there is some hardship in forsaking houses and lands. The manses of Scotland are pleasant homes; and if you will ask any friend who ever took leave of one, he will tell you that it was a desolate day when the *flitting* was moving down the avenue, and after seeing that the kitchen-fire was out, and taking a last look of the dismantled parlour, he delivered the key to the new-comer, shook hands with the neighbours, and went away. The manse of a good minister is a hallowed dwelling, and more of in-door quiet, and family affection, and Sabbath-gladdness, is condensed into it than into any home on earth; and after one who has been long its inmate has taken his last look of the deserted fields and smokeless chimneys, he feels it of little moment where he shall kindle his next fire. Besides, it is the place where all the parish naturally resort when advice or assistance is needed; where the sick send for cordials, and the sad go for comfort, and the perplexed go for counsel; and whose simple hospitality ranges from the Sunday scholars up to the parish elders, the farmers, and, sometimes, the *laird*. The consequence is, that though the Great House may be shut up for years,

and the landlord with his establishment cease to sojourn in it, except in rare instances, it will not awaken such tenderness on either side as a removal from the manse. The people of Scotland are not given to the melting mood ; and two centuries ago, when 400 ministers were constrained to leave their parishes for conscience' sake, they felt it very hard ; but neither they nor their people said much. When the *creels** were getting ready, the wife would, perhaps, draw a corner of her apron across her eyes, and the children could not very well comprehend it. There was little demonstration of feeling ; and judging by the peaceful submission of the pastors, and the silence of their people, you would almost have thought that they acquiesced in the doings of that day. It was an illusion. The heart of Scotland was heaving with an indignant sorrow, which found its first relief when it hurled James Stuart from the throne. Should 400 ministers again be forced from their people and their homes, there will be no commotion. All will pass over silently and peacefully ; but in the hearts which constitute the heart of Scotland, in the bosoms of its noble-minded and Christian people, will be left a lasting and cruel sense of injury.

There are other hardships connected with this case which I will not weary you by detailing. For instance, within the last eight years, and at a cost of about 300,000*l.*, the people of Scotland, with a few extraneous contributions, have built nearly 200 new churches for themselves. Almost all of these churches are built and occupied by people and supplied by ministers who must leave the Establishment, unless the Establishment be emancipated. And what

* Large panniers slung over the horse's back, in which the young children were carried. When Mr. Dunbar, the minister of Ayr, who had once before been banished from his parish, received a summons to leave it a second time, he merely said, "Well, goodwife, ye must e'en provide the *creels* again." The saying became a sort of proverb.

forms the hardship of this case is, that when the ministers and people go, the churches which they have reared at such a sacrifice will be claimed by others. Besides, many parishes are the property of a single individual, and that individual may be so hostile to the Gospel as to refuse ground for erecting another place of worship. Again, the India and other missions of the Church of Scotland have been mainly supported by the parties about to be driven from the Church. The mission premises will fall into the hands of parties unable or unwilling to support them. The missions will be broken up; and with crippled resources, the faithful remnant will be ill able to organize them anew. And last of all, some of the parishes which most prize the Gospel are least able to support it. In many places, the utmost efforts of the people are insufficient to procure food and raiment for themselves. It would be mockery to ask them to maintain a ministry. It would be depriving them of their greatest blessing for either world, to take the ministry away. Putting out of view the intrinsic merits of the case, the constitutional rights of the Church of Scotland, the equity of her claim, it would surely need to be a strong necessity which would justify any Legislature in virtually driving from their homes 500 ministers of Christ, scattering the largest and liveliest congregations in Scotland; and leaving as sheep without a shepherd those parishes which most prize a faithful ministry.

Perhaps some may say, But why go out? Who bids them go? Why not obey the law of the land, and remain where they are? I answer, or rather they answer for themselves, Because the law is such that they cannot obey it. Had they known soon enough, that the civil law is what it is now declared to be, they would never have entered the Established Church; and if the Legislature understand the law as the civil courts interpret it, now that they are in the Established Church they must

leave it again. They wish to obey the law of the land, and in the hope that haply if they were out of the Establishment the law would then ask them to do nothing contrary to their consciences, they are leaving the Establishment. They go because they feel that it would be sinful to remain. Even as I might leave my dwelling if I found that the lease by which I hold it contained a stipulation with which it were criminal to comply. If I entered in ignorance of its import, and if, now that I know the construction put upon it, I cannot get it altered, I must even go. It may be very hard, but I cannot help it. The ministers of Scotland wish to lead quiet and peaceable lives; and rather than disturb the peace, they will abandon their earthly all. Outside of the Establishment they are sure to find a clear conscience; and there also there is more hope of a quiet unmolested life.

3. Our common Christianity is endangered.

The *principle* for which the Church of Scotland is contending is one dear to every Christian man. It is one for which the early Nonconformists and the New England worthies contended so nobly—that God alone is Lord of the conscience, and that the highest tribunal on earth may not abridge the liberty wherewith Christ hath made his people free. The doctrine of the Church of Scotland is, that the head of every spiritual man is Christ, and that when a company of spiritual men meet together in their spiritual capacity, Christ is still their Head. In other words, they hold that **THE LORD JESUS CHRIST IS THE ONLY KING AND HEAD OF THE CHURCH**. In their ecclesiastical procedure they desire to follow his will as that will is revealed in his Word. They believe that the Spirit of God, speaking through spiritual men, is the sole interpreter of that Word; and they cannot allow the commandments of men—the verdicts of secular courts—to interpose between them and their Heavenly King. Every Bible Christian will sympathize with

them here. Daniel and his friends were not rebels. They were faithful to their king, though the king was a Pagan, and their conqueror. But in matters of faith they deemed it no disloyalty to disregard his decrees. The apostles respected lawful authority, but with the commission of their Master, "Preach the Gospel to every creature," they could not suffer any tribunal to interfere. "We ought to obey God rather than men." And every Christian, be he a minister or a private member of the Church, will acknowledge that there are many things "pertaining to the law of his God" in which he could not consent to be ruled by secular men.

The Church of Scotland is an Established Church. Its ministers are endowed. But it has always been their belief that in accepting this endowment they surrendered nothing. Their theory of an Establishment is, that the nation selects a Church whose constitution and worship it approves, and on this Church, for the benefit of the nation, bestows the bounty of an endowment. But they do not see how this necessarily implies subjection to the State, or the loss of any spiritual privilege. Suppose a rich man endowed a Dissenting chapel, it is presumed that upon the whole he approves of the doctrines taught and the worship practised there; whilst, on the other hand, their accepting of his liberality does not imply that they give him the power of admitting or rejecting the members, or of tampering with the internal order of that Church. The Church of Scotland existed as a *Church* before it became an *Establishment*. The nation found it a Church already existing. The nation approved its polity, its doctrines, and worship. The nation offered to take it *even as it stood*, and endow it. The Church accepted the nation's offer. But so far from surrendering any peculiarity or privilege, it was expressly stipulated that, in accepting this endowment, the Church should surrender nothing—that it should remain the same free, and spiritual, and

independent Church which it had ever been. And whatever may be the case with other endowed Churches, it has always been the belief of its members that the Church of Scotland, *though Established, is free*—as free as Churches not Established are. In other words, the office-bearers and members of the Scotch Establishment believed that if civil courts found a pretext for interfering with them, they would find as good a pretext for interfering with the office-bearers and members of non-established Churches.

In this confidence, the Church of Scotland has not erred. In the case of the Scotch Secession Church, the Court of Session has recently laid down the principle, that even this Church, in the exercise of its spiritual jurisdiction, is amenable to the civil magistrate. The Court of Session claims the power of discharging seceder ministers and elders from proceeding against heretical or disorderly members, in cases where civil consequences, such as loss of character or emolument, are involved. And as every case may be reduced to this category, the Court of Session virtually claims the power of reviewing and altering the sentences of all religious communities, established and non-established, within the kingdom of Scotland.

I think that all Christian men should view this last result with consternation. It is the working out of a principle which every faithful follower of Christ is bound to resist in its beginnings, for it will eventually be the destruction of all our Churches, and the death of religious freedom.

Independently of this, I cannot view the coming overthrow of the Scotch Establishment—for if its best ministers and most devoted members be driven out of it, it is virtually overthrown—I cannot contemplate the destruction of the Scotch Establishment at the present moment without apprehension. Different Churches have been honoured to testify for different truths; but of all National Churches the Church of Scotland has borne the loudest

and most emphatic testimony to the *Supremacy of Christ*. It has testified for this truth in opposition to the supremacy of the priesthood on the one hand, and of the civil power on the other. It protests that the clergy shall not be "lords over God's heritage;" but recognising every regenerate man as one of the "royal priesthood," claims for the Christian people rights with which even the Christian pastor must not intermeddle. And on the other hand it protests, that Cæsar shall not claim the things which belong to God; but believing that Christ's "kingdom is not of this world," it claims for the rulers in Christ's house, rights and privileges with which the secular ruler must not interfere. These privileges of the Christian people, and this independence of the Church, are obnoxious alike to spiritual despots and unbelieving worldlings. The lordly ecclesiastic cannot trust the people; the infidel civilian cannot trust the Church. The supremacy of Christ is doubly assaulted at this day; and if the faithful Witness which has prophesied this truth so long should now be slain, a main barrier to Infidel and Papal incursions will be taken out of the way.

Christian Brethren of this free English land, I leave the matter with you. Necessity was laid on me when I took up this pen, and nothing but a solemn conviction of duty could have urged me to bring this matter before you in a season of so many and momentous exigencies as is this. I believe that the case of the Church of Scotland is a case of injustice and oppression, and I believe that it is in the power of the people of England, by petitioning Parliament and enlightening their respective representatives, to redress the wrong and remove the grievance. I have much faith in the justice of Englishmen, and some experience of their generosity; but I have more faith in Christianity, than even in national character. I believe that a man who is both just and generous may be too busy to attend to an appeal; or even if he do

attend, that he may miss the merits of the case, and not comprehending it, may pronounce an unrighteous judgment. But I believe this is a case which every enlightened Christian may understand, for its first principles are familiar to him. And I believe, moreover, that it is a case in which English Christianity is concerned, "for if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it."† And I believe, finally, that it is a case in which English Christians will lend their sympathy and aid—for such is the Master's will: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil THE LAW OF CHRIST."

Should any reader desire to study this question more carefully, I know nothing more simple and satisfactory, than "Letters on the First Principles of the Church Controversy, by Patrick McFarlan, D.D." The Church's "Claim of Right," and the Convocation's "Memorial to Government," contain all the merits of the case. The Convocation's "Address to the People of Scotland," is singularly beautiful, and abundantly plain. Still shorter and very conclusive are Addresses to their parishioners by the Rev. John A. Wallace, of Hawick, and Rev. Horatius Bonar, of Kelso. Those who desire to learn the history of the Church of Scotland will find it most philosophically told by Dr. McCrie, most pleasantly by his son, and most poetically, yet truthfully, by Mr. Hetherington.